G. R. S. IX-5

Previous references.

1918.

(Muzrai)

File No. 521-18

Serial Nos. 1—4

Later references

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—4

Part B for October 1919

SUBJECT.

Archakaship of Sri Venkataramanaswamy temple at Karighatta in the Seringapatam Taluk.

No. 1147 d.

To The Dy. Commr. Mysore Dt.

Directs the removal of the [illegible] from the ——————

W D 1250--GPB—30,000 28-1-19

[illegible] Recorded 30.10.1919.

G. R. S. III-1] 1918.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Muzrai)

NOTES.

File No. 520-18

FILE HEADING.

Archakship of Sri Venkataramana Swami temple at Karighatta in the Seringapatam taluk.

From

G. Srinivasa Rao and certain other residents of [illegible].

-No.- Petition Dated Received 1. .19

Diary No. 1498] Enclos. Spare Copies [Serial No

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Appeal against the Dy Commissioner's [illegible] Seshiengar to the Archakship of the said temple.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

C

The petition is duly stamped. The Dy. Commrs. order appealed against is dated 24-9-18. A copy of the order was applied for on 26-11-1918 but was granted on 28-12-1918. The appeal was received on 1st March 1919. Owing to complaints

NOTES–First Sheet.

808

G. R. S. 111-2]

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

Mur File No. 520 of 191

Serial
No.

D

against the Archak Seshiengar on more occasions than ~~[illegible]~~ one, the Sub Divl Officer ordered* the dismissal of the Archak while to give the Archak another chance, the Dy. Commr changed the order of dismissal into one of Suspension for a year.

G. Srinivasa Iyer & others of Srirangapatna have appealed against the Dy. Commrs. order and state that Seshiengar has since taken charge of Archak duties in the ~~[illegible]~~ temple.

The grounds for appeal are summarized in the appeal petition.

Submitted.

u. 3" 4.8.19.

The appeal is within time. It may if appd be sent to the Dy Commr. for report with records.

The local officers have been prompt, to judge from the enclosures to the petn., to notice the delinquencies of the erring archak. – The petrs. view the order of the Dy Comr limiting the disciplinary punishment to suspension for one year with apprehension and urge in effect that it may be revised. The allegations made regarding the conduct of the Archak have to be enquired into by the local officers.

+Vide para 2 of petn.)

NOTE—Contn sheet.

3.

In these circumstances. it looks as if there is no need for orders of Govt about the Dy Comr's decision. The petrs may be told to apply to the local Muzrai Officers with their Complaints against the Archak.

K.S.
5/3/19.

Secy)

This is a case in which it is to be feared that the Dy Commr has not exercised his discretion rightly or at all events in the interests of the institution.

The most important charges against the Archak were that he was leading a life which makes him unfit to conduct worship in the temple and that he has behaved with studied disrespect to the deity in leaving the image with wet clothes. These are not circumstances where considerate treatment to the Archak is likely to redound to the credit of the institution.

I have heard bitter complaints against the Archak not only in his behaviour to the devotee public but in his casual attitude as a worshipper

4

G. R. S. 111-2]

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

Muz File No. 520 of 1918.

Serial No.

and. I was myself present when the man's delinquencies were enquired into by the Sub-div: Officer. If even half the things I heard about him are true I have no hesitation in saying that the sooner he is removed from temple service, the better ~~it~~ will it be in the interests of the Hindu religion.

It is just here that a Govt department is weak. The Muzrai Supdt. has at present practically no ~~means~~ way of bringing into effective use his know of men's qualifications and defects. With a freer hand he might help to improve the tone of the temple service though the methods may look somewhat arbitrary. On this question I shall submit a separate note dealing with the matter as a whole.

As regards the present petition it is difficult to see what can be done. The man has been restored and ~~the Govt cannot well adopt an order a dismissal without a satisfactory proof of the man's unfitness on moral grounds and~~ as a mere disciplinary punishment it is doubtful if. Two

Note—Contn. sheet.

(5

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

[illegible] File No. 520 of 1918

Serial No.	

Public can be said to have a voice in the matter.

[illegible]

(1st member) 6.3.19

683
7.3.19

The Govt is not bound to uphold the D. J. Commr's order if it is found to be erroneous.^

^ The interests of religious worship are paramount.

Issue orders that ~~the D. Commr's~~ pending final decision by Govt on the appeal petn., the D. Commr's order of reinstatement shall not be given effect to, but that, if it has been already, the archaka may at once be relieved temporarily pending such final decision.

Meanwhile call for all the original papers & submit them with a clear precis. [illegible] on perusal of the same, [illegible] hear the [illegible] & the archaka personally; but perhaps this may not be necessary.

11 [illegible]

Draft

[illegible]
11-3-19

11/3/19

a V
11/3

Note—Contn. sheet.

1099

16

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Muz File No. 520 of 1918

Serial No.	
	Submit with off.
	M 11.3.19
	11/3/19
	Secy
	17/3/19
	Appd
	15/3/19
	15/3/19
2.	No 2847 Dt 20.3.19. To D.C. Mysore Calls for a detailed report and requests that pending final decision of Govt. the D.C.'s order of reinstatement should not be given effect to but that if it has been already done so the Archak may at once be relieved of his duties temporarily pending such fur[illegible]
3.	From, The Dy Commr, Mysore Dist, Letter no 555 Dt [illegible]
	Submits the records [illegible] the case, and states that the [illegible] Divl Officer reported to him that [illegible] Seshiengar could not be relieved [illegible] another competent Archak could not be found, and adds that [illegible] in obedience to Govt. [illegible] the Sub Divl Officer to try [illegible] a substitute for Seshiengar [illegible]

Note—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. of 191 .

Serial No.

Pending [illegible] al.

From a perusal of the records, it will be seen that a clear and succinct account of the facts of the case is given in the Dy. Comr.'s orders Dt 24-9-1918.

A, B.

Attention is respectfully invited to 2 largely-signed petitions in the [illegible] records complaining against Archak Seshiengar.

It is complained that respectable female devotees find it difficult to resort to the temple, that the Archak and his brother are mischievous and mess etc. with low-caste people, that the deity loses its sanctity if these are continued, that if these people touch the deity, the devotees will not accept Teertha and Prasada etc.

It is also reported that Vykhanasa form of worship is in vogue in the temple and that it is difficult to find Vykhanasa Archaks.

If directed, the case will be put.

Submitted for orders.

18/9/19

3rd member)

8/9/19

707
19/9/19

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. 111-2]

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

1495

Muz File No. 520 of 1918

Serial No.

The Archak in question has had quite a bad record. Though he was ~~once~~ punished twice before this had no effect on him & he again misbehaved & was ~~[illegible]~~ dismissed for it by the D. C. Dewan But his punishment was reduced by the Dewan to suspension for one year for ~~[illegible]~~ ~~then~~. There have been several complaints against ~~him~~ this archak. he does not seem to command the confidence & respect of the devotees of the temple. It is absolutely necessary that the Archak of a temple should be one whose character is above reproach & who ~~[illegible]~~ enjoys the confidence & confidence of the people resorting to the institution. I think it would be misplaced leniency to ~~continue~~ allow the archak in question to remain any longer in the office in view of his previous record, & of the allegations against him. He should therefore be removed at once [illegible]

14/9

AMT
15.9.19

Submitted with a draft order.

16.9.19

AMT 18/9/19

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

WD A 789—GPB—60,000—20-3-18—S.

Presented by one of the signatories in person
To be submitted to the member with previous references

658
COURT FEE
27.2.19
TWO RUPEES

1482

08 29
MO
5 20-18

DR
1/3/19

582
1-3-19

To The First Member of Council to ~~The Dewan in Council~~, H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore
Bangalore.

Work up and very early.

lw
3/3/19

Most respected Sir,

DS.
3/3/19.

We, the undersigned beg to bring the following few lines to your kind and favourable consideration.

OV
3/3

1. That one Seshiengar is the Archak of Sri Venkataramanaswamy temple at Karighatta, Seringapatam Taluk.

2. That he has been very negligent in his duties as Archak and he does not perform the puja in the proper manner at proper times and does not observe the usual 'mamuls' in regard to 'Maryadas'.

3. That several complaints have been made against the said Seshaiengar for his defaults and on 19-2-16, the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore suspended

him and on the recommendation of the Amildar after the lapse of two months, he was pleased to cancel the suspension order with a strict warning, however, that "should he give room for complaint again, he will be removed."

That again on 22-3-17, a Complaint was received ~~by~~ against the said Seshiengar and on enquiry by the Amildar, he was fined Rs 5/.

That once again the said Seshiengar failed in due discharge of his duties and on a report submitted by the Amildar, the Sub-division Officer of French Rocks after perusing the records and recording the statements of Seshiengar ~~passed an od~~ expressed an opinion that the said Seshiengar was unfit to be an archak and passed an order of dismissal on 6-2-18, having regard to the opinion expressed by the Deputy Commissioner in his order dated 19-2-16.

That the said Seshiengar appealed against this order of the Sub-division Officer and the Deputy Commissioner commuted the order of dismissal into one of suspension for one year

COURT FEE
[illegible]
9/2/18
[illegible]
EIGHT ANNAS

Copy of the order made by the Sub Division Officer, French Rocks, on 6th February 1918 dismissing Archak Seshiengar from the temple service of Sri-Venkataramana Swami temple at Karighatta prepared as prayed for, by Shanbhogue Narasimhachar of Maralagala, residing in Ganjam, Seringapatam Taluk.

[illegible] 5-11-17 [illegible] 122 [illegible]

[illegible] 19-2-1916 [illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible] 5-11-17 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

1916 ನೇ [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

French Rocks
6-2-1918.

Sd. B.C Krishna Sastri
Sub-Divn Magte.

Copy applied on 3-1-1919
Copy ready on 29-1-1919
copy delivered on 29-1-1919.
No of words. - - - 330
Copying fees - - - 0-6-0
Comparing fee - - - 0-1-4.
Copied by K. Ramanna.

Compared by
M. Sreedevara

Copy.
B.O.
A. Krishnarao
Head Clerk
Sub-Divn Magte
French Rocks.

The petitioners, therefore, most respectfully pray that previous records may be sent for and after perusal of the same the order restoring the said Seshiengar to the office of Archak may be cancelled and that another proper person be appointed in his place. [illegible] We beg to remain,

Most respected Sir,

Your most obedient servants

[illegible]

G. Srinivasa Rao

[illegible]

N. [illegible]

A. [illegible]

That the petitioners now learn that the said Seshiengar has taken charge of his duties as Archak and they view with apprehension his reinstatement to that office.

That the petitioners beg to submit that Seshiengar is the most unfit person for the place and that ~~who~~ once again he has become the Archak, the affairs of the temple would be as bad. as before and his appointment ~~and~~ has given much discontentment and dissatisfaction to the numerous 'bhaktas' of Sri Venkataramanaswamy Temple.

That the order of the Sub-Division Officer dismissing Seshiengar was the proper order in the circumstances of the case and that the Deputy Commissioner has been unnecessarily lenient in showing him a concession.

That between the date of dismissal order and the date of reinstatement of the said Seshiengar, the keys of the Temple were with him and that there was theft of the Temple properties and the said Seshiengar had been arrested by the Police under suspicion, and that his character is very unsatisfactory.

G. R. S. VI—G/32] 2 D/5

SUBJECT Calls for early report with [illegible] on the appeal petition complaining against [illegible] [illegible]

Diary No. of letter replied to

Section I-Gen.
File No. 520-18
Serial No. 2

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT,
( )
, the 191 .

No. 2847/[illegible]

Date of issue 20-3-1919

Signed by M. M. [illegible]

To

The Dy. Commr.,
Mysore Dist.,

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith for very early submission of a detailed report with all the original papers, petition regd. no. 1498 received on 1st March 1919 from G. Srinivasa Iyer and certain other residents of Seringapatam appealing against ~~your~~ The Dy Commr's orders [illegible]

over.

the restoration of Seshiengar to the Archakship of Sri Venkataramana Swami temple at Karighatta, and to request that pending final decision by Govt on the appeal petition, the Dy. Commr's order of reinstatement should not be given effect to, but that, if it has been done so already, the Archak may at once be relieved of his duties temporarily ~~temporarily~~ pending such final decision ~~from the orders of Govt. in the matter~~ ~~such final decision~~

I have etc.

15/3/19

Joint Secty,

Muz. Deptt

D.O. 17/3/19

11/3/19

List of enclosure

Copied by

Examined by

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT 2765

Diary No. of letter replied to

Section
File No.
Serial No.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT,
( )
, the 191 .

No. 2848

Date of issue 20 . 3 . 1919

Signed by Mr. M. [illegible]

~~To~~

With reference to their petition regd. no. 1498 received on 1st March 1919 appealing against the Dy. Commr's order directing the restoration of Seshiengar to the Archakship of Sri Venkataramana Swami temple at Karighatta in the Seringapatam Taluk, G. Sreenivasa Rao, and certain other residents of Seringapatam are informed that

over.

The Dy. Cr. ~~a report with~~ the record
have been called for from the
Dy. Commr, Mymne Distt.,
who has also been requested to stay
~~not to give~~ giving effect to his
order of re instatement pending
final decision by Govt. on the
appeal petition; but that if
it has been already, the Brehak
may at once be relieved
temporarily pending such
final decision.

By order
15/3/19

KS. 12/3/19.

Joint Secretary,
Muz. Deptt.

11/3/19

List of enclosure

Copied by

Examined by

WD 86—GPB—60,000—15-11 16

WD 0463—GPB—3,00,000—21-7-17—3.

69098 1919

2020

18 19
Mur
FILE No. 520-18
SERL. 3

From
The deputy commissioner
Mysore district

To
The joint secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Muzrai Department
Bangalore

Dated 5th May 19

Despatched 6th May 19.

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

Submits records relating to the restoration of Seshiengar to the Archakship of Sri Venkataramana Swamy Temple at Karighatta.

Office of the Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

Dated, Mysore, 5th May 1919.

From,

T. Chokkanna, Esquire., B.A.,
Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District.

To,

G. Aravamudu Iyengar, Esquire., B.A., B.L.,
Joint secretary to Government,
Muzrai Department, Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter no.2347/muz 520-18-2 dated 20th March 1919, calling for the records relating to the restoration of Sesha Iyengar to the Archakship of Sri Venkataramana Swamy Temple at Kari Ghatta, I have the honor to submit herewith the vernacular file ~~file~~ of records ending with the Sub Division Officer's No.H.C. 1310 dated 12th April 1919, and to state that the Sub Division Officer reports that Archak Seshiengar could not be relieved as another competent Archak could not be found. I have in obedience to Government order requested the Sub Division Officer, to try and ~~in obedience of Government order~~ find a substitute for the said Seshiengar pending the disposal of the matter by Government.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
V S Vasudeva Rao
For Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

G.R.S. VI-71]

SUBJECT Directs the removal of Seshiengar from the Archakaship of Sri Venkataramana Swami temple at Karighatta, S. Patam Taluk

Diary No. of letter replied to 2020

Section R

File No. 520-18

Serial No. 4

General and Revenue Secretariat ( )

, the 191 .

Proceedings of the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

Date of issue 9/10/99

Signed by Mr. A. M[illegible] Iyengar

Ex

Read.— Petition regd. no 1498 dated dated 1st March 1919 from G. Srinivasa Rao and certain other residents of Seringapatam appealing against the Dy. Commr's order directing the restoration of Seshaiengar to the Archakaship of Sri Venkataramana Swami temple at Karighatta in the Seringapatam Taluk.

Order Thereon:— No.

May this be

- *i Printed?*
- *ii treated as a standing order?*
- *iii published in the Gazette English part?*
- *iv translated?*
- *v placed at the disposal of the press?*
- *vi published in the Gazette Kannada part?*

over.

Letter no. 555 Dy 6th May 1919 from the Dy. Commr, Mysore Distt, submitting the records connected with the case.

Order thereon No. 1147/ Muz 520-18-4 Enclos/file
d. [illegible]

~~Govt observe from a perusal of the records~~ On a perusal of the records in the case Govt. observe that the Archak in question has had quite a bad record. Though he was punished twice before, this had no effect on him and he again misbehaved and was dismissed ~~for it~~ by the Sub Divn officer. But the punishment was reduced by the Dy. Commr to one of suspension for one year. There have been several complaints against this Archak and he does not evidently command the confidence

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

G.R. S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE
SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

and respect of the devotees of the Temple. It is absolutely necessary that the Archak of a Temple should be one whose character is above reproach and who enjoys the good will and confidence of the people resorting to the institution. Govt consider that it will be misplaced leniency to allow the Archak in question to continue any longer in his office in spite of his previous record and of the allegations against him, ~~and direct that the~~ he should therefore be removed at once from ~~the~~ office.

21/9/19

15.9.19

D.C.)

Secretary,
[illegible] Deptt.
16.9.19

18/9/19

To,

The Dy. Commr., [illegible]
[illegible], returning the records